

1 Todd M. Friedman, Esq. (SBN: 216752)  
2 Nicholas J. Bontrager, Esq. (SBN: 252114)  
3 Suren N. Weerasuriya, Esq. (SBN: 278521)  
4 tfriedman@attorneysforconsumers.com  
5 nbontrager@attorneysforconsumers.com  
6 sweerasuriya@attorneysforconsumers.com

7 **LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.**

8 324 S. Beverly Dr., #725  
9 Beverly Hills, CA 90212

10 Telephone: (877) 206-4741  
11 Facsimile: (866) 633-0228

12 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
14 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

15 **JOSHUA FRIEDMAN,  
16 INDIVIDUALLY AND ON  
17 BEHALF OF ALL OTHERS  
18 SIMILARLY SITUATED,**

19 Plaintiff,

20 **NUTRIBULLET, LLC, AND  
21 TRIBUNE BROADCASTING  
22 COMPANY, LLC,**

23 Defendants.

24 **Case No.:**

25 **CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT FOR  
26 DAMAGES**

27 **JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

28 1. JOSHUA FRIEDMAN (“Plaintiff”) brings this Class Action  
Complaint for damages, injunctive relief, and any other available legal or  
equitable remedies, resulting from the illegal actions of NUTRIBULLET, LLC  
 (“Defendant Nutribullet”), and TRIBUNE BROADCASTING COMPANY, LLC.  
 (“Defendant Tribune”) in negligently and/or willfully contacting Plaintiff on  
 Plaintiff’s cellular telephone, in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection  
 Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., (“TCPA”), thereby invading Plaintiff’s privacy.  
 Plaintiff alleges as follows upon personal knowledge as to himself and his own

1 acts and experiences, and, as to all other matters, upon information and belief,  
2 including investigation conducted by his attorneys.

3 2. The TCPA was designed to prevent calls and text messages like the  
4 ones described herein, and to protect the privacy of citizens like Plaintiff.  
5 “Voluminous consumer complaints about abuses of telephone technology – for  
6 example, computerized calls dispatched to private homes – prompted Congress to  
7 pass the TCPA.” *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740, 744 (2012).

8 3. In enacting the TCPA, Congress intended to give consumers a choice  
9 as to how corporate similar entities may contact them, and made specific findings  
10 that “[t]echnologies that might allow consumers to avoid receiving such calls are  
11 not universally available, are costly, are unlikely to be enforced, or place an  
12 inordinate burden on the consumer. TCPA, Pub.L. No. 102–243, § 11. In  
13 support of this, Congress found that

14 [b]anning such automated or prerecorded telephone  
15 calls to the home, except when the receiving party  
16 consents to receiving the call or when such calls are  
17 necessary in an emergency situation affecting the health  
18 and safety of the consumer, is the only effective means  
19 of protecting telephone consumers from this nuisance  
and privacy invasion.

20 *Id.* at § 12; see also *Martin v. Leading Edge Recovery Solutions, LLC*, 2012 WL  
21 3292838, at\* 4 (N.D.Ill. Aug. 10, 2012) (citing Congressional findings on  
22 TCPA’s purpose).

23 4. Congress also specifically found that “the evidence presented to the  
24 Congress indicates that automated or prerecorded calls are a nuisance and an  
25 invasion of privacy, regardless of the type of call....” *Id.* at §§ 12-13. See also,  
26 *Mims*, 132 S. Ct. at 744.

1       5.    As Judge Easterbrook of the Seventh Circuit recently explained in a  
2   TCPA case regarding calls to a non-debtor similar to this one:

3  
4       The Telephone Consumer Protection Act ... is well  
5   known for its provisions limiting junk-fax  
6   transmissions. A less-litigated part of the Act curtails  
7   the use of automated dialers and prerecorded messages  
8   to cell phones, whose subscribers often are billed by the  
9   minute as soon as the call is answered—and routing a  
10   call to voicemail counts as answering the call. An  
11   automated call to a landline phone can be an  
12   annoyance; an automated call to a cell phone adds  
13   expense to annoyance.

14  
15       *Soppet v. Enhanced Recovery Co., LLC*, 679 F.3d 637, 638 (7th Cir. 2012).

16       **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

17       6.    This Court has federal question jurisdiction because this case arises  
18   out of violations of federal law. 47 U.S.C. §227(b); *Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs.,*  
19   *LLC*, 132 S. Ct. 740 (2012).

20       7.    Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Central  
21   District of California pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and 1441(a) because  
22   Defendants are subject to personal jurisdiction in the County of Los Angeles,  
23   State of California, and Plaintiff resides within the County of Los Angeles, State  
24   of California.

25       **PARTIES**

26       8.    Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a citizen and  
27   resident of the State of California. Plaintiff is, and at all times mentioned herein  
28   was, a “person” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).

29       9.    Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that  
30   Defendant Nutribullet is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a corporation

1 whose State of Incorporation is California and principal place of business is in the  
2 State of California. Defendant Nutribullet, is and at all times mentioned herein  
3 was, a corporation and is a “person,” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).  
4 Plaintiff alleges that at all times relevant herein Defendant Nutribullet conducted  
5 business in the State of California and in the County of Los Angeles, and within  
6 this judicial district.

7 10. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that  
8 Defendant Tribune is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a corporation whose  
9 State of Incorporation is Illinois and principal place of business is in the State of  
10 Illinois. Defendant Tribune, is and at all times mentioned herein was, a  
11 corporation and is a “person,” as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39). Plaintiff  
12 alleges that at all times relevant herein Defendant Tribune conducted business in  
13 the State of California and in the County of Los Angeles, and within this judicial  
14 district.

16

### 17 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

18 11. Beginning sometime on or around March 09 of 2014, Defendants  
19 began to utilize Plaintiff’s cellular telephone number, ending in 5289, in an  
20 attempt to solicit Plaintiff’s business by sending unsolicited/unauthorized spam  
21 text messages.

22 12. On at least one (1) occasion, that being March 09, 2014, Defendants  
23 sent the following text message to Plaintiff’s cellular telephone:

24 **Thanks for supporting the**  
25 **L.A. Marathon. Check out**  
26 **NutriBulooza at mile 15!**  
27 **[http://www.nutribulooza.c](http://www.nutribulooza.com)**  
28 **om – Txt STOP2quit, Txt**  
**HELP4help Msg&Data**  
**rates apply**

13. The text Defendants placed to Plaintiff's cellular telephone was placed via an "automatic telephone dialing system," ("ATDS") as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (a)(1) as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).

14. This ATDS has the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be dialed, using a random or sequential number generator.

15. The telephone number that Defendants, or their agents, called was assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming calls pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1).

16. These text messages constituted calls that were not for emergency purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A)(i).

17. At no time did Plaintiff provide Defendants or their agents with written prior express consent to receive unsolicited text messages, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).

18. These telephone calls by Defendants, or their agents, violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).

## CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

19. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and on behalf of and all others similarly situated (“the Class”).

20. Plaintiff represents, and is a member of, the Class, consisting of All persons within the United States who received any text message/s from Defendants or their agent/s and/or employee/s to said person's cellular telephone made through the use of any automatic telephone dialing system within the four years prior to the filling of the Complaint.

21. Defendants and their employees or agents are excluded from the Class. Plaintiff does not know the number of members in the Class, but believes the Class members number in the thousands, if not more. Thus, this matter

1 should be certified as a Class action to assist in the expeditious litigation of this  
2 matter.

3 22. Plaintiff and members of the Class were harmed by the acts of  
4 Defendants in at least the following ways: Defendants, either directly or through  
5 their agents, illegally contacted Plaintiff and the Class members via their cellular  
6 telephones, thereby causing Plaintiff and the Class members to incur certain  
7 cellular telephone charges or reduce cellular telephone time for which Plaintiff  
8 and the Class members previously paid, and invading the privacy of said Plaintiff  
9 and the Class members. Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged thereby.

10 23. This suit seeks only damages and injunctive relief for recovery of  
11 economic injury on behalf of the Class, and it expressly is not intended to request  
12 any recovery for personal injury and claims related thereto. Plaintiff reserves the  
13 right to expand the Class definition to seek recovery on behalf of additional  
14 persons as warranted as facts are learned in further investigation and discovery.

15 24. The joinder of the Class members is impractical and the disposition  
16 of their claims in the Class action will provide substantial benefits both to the  
17 parties and to the court. The Class can be identified through Defendants' records  
18 or Defendants' agents' records.

19 25. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law  
20 and fact involved affecting the parties to be represented. The questions of law  
21 and fact to the Class predominate over questions which may affect individual  
22 Class members, including the following:

23 a) Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of this Complaint,  
24 Defendants or their agents placed any calls to the Class (other than a  
25 call made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express  
26 consent of the called party) to a Class member using any automatic

dialing system to any telephone number assigned to a cellular phone service;

- b) Whether Plaintiff and the Class members were damaged thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and
- c) Whether Defendants and their agents should be enjoined from engaging in such conduct in the future.

26. As a person that received autodialed text messages from Defendants via an automated telephone dialing system, Plaintiff is asserting claims that are typical of the Class. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class in that Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to any member of the Class.

27. Plaintiff and the members of the Class have all suffered irreparable harm as a result of Defendants' unlawful and wrongful conduct. Absent a class action, the Class will continue to face the potential for irreparable harm. In addition, these violations of law will be allowed to proceed without remedy and Defendants will likely continue such illegal conduct. Because of the size of the individual Class member's claims, few, if any, Class members could afford to seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein.

28. Plaintiff has retained counsel experienced in handling class action claims and claims involving violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.

29. A class action is a superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Class-wide damages are essential to induce Defendants to comply with federal and California law. The interest of Class members in individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims against Defendants is small because the maximum statutory damages in an individual action for violation of privacy are minimal. Management of these claims is likely

1 to present significantly fewer difficulties than those presented in many class  
2 claims.

3 30. Defendants have acted on grounds generally applicable to the Class,  
4 thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief and corresponding declaratory  
5 relief with respect to the Class as a whole.  
6

7 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
8 **NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER**  
9 **PROTECTION ACT**  
10 **47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.**

11 33. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this  
12 Complaint as though fully stated herein.

13 34. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendants constitute numerous  
14 and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each  
15 and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.

16 35. As a result of Defendants' negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et  
17 seq, Plaintiff and The Class are entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory  
18 damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

19 36. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief  
20 prohibiting such conduct in the future.

21 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
22 **KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE**  
23 **CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT**  
24 **47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.**

25 37. Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this  
26 Complaint as though fully stated herein.

27 38. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendants constitute numerous  
28 and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not

1 limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et  
2 seq.

3 39. As a result of Defendants' knowing and/or willful violations of 47  
4 U.S.C. § 227 et seq, Plaintiff and The Class are entitled to an award of \$1,500.00  
5 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §  
6 227(b)(3)(C).

7 40. Plaintiff and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief  
8 prohibiting such conduct in the future.

9 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

10 11 Wherefore, Plaintiff respectfully requests the Court grant Plaintiff and The  
12 Class members the following relief against Defendants:

13 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE**  
14 **TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.**

15 41. As a result of Defendants' negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. §  
16 227(b)(1), Plaintiff seeks for himself and each Class member \$500.00 in statutory  
17 damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).

18 42. Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting  
19 such conduct in the future.

20 43. Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper.

21 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL**  
22 **VIOLATIONS OF THE TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.**

23 44. As a result of Defendants' knowing and/or willful violations of 47  
24 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), Plaintiff seeks for himself and each Class member \$1,500.00  
25 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §  
26 227(b)(3)(C).

45. Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

46. Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper.

## TRIAL BY JURY

47. Pursuant to the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, Plaintiffs are entitled to, and demand, a trial by jury.

Respectfully submitted May 01, 2014

## LAW OFFICES OF TODD M. FRIEDMAN, P.C.

By: /s/Todd M. Friedman  
Todd M. Friedman  
Law Offices of Todd M. Friedman  
Attorney for Plaintiff